

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

CRAIG PRICE	:	
	:	C.A. No. 04-38S
v.	:	C.A. No. 12-24S
	:	
ASHBEL T. WALL, et. al.,	:	

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Lincoln D. Almond, United States Magistrate Judge

Pending before the Court is Craig Price’s Motion for Leave to Appeal In Forma Pauperis (“IFP”). (Document No. 36 in 04-38S; Document No. 25 in 12-24S). I recommend that the District Court DENY Price’s Motion.

In the present case, Price qualifies for pauper status based on the documentation he submitted in connection with his Affidavit. However, the Court cannot grant Price’s Motion because Price’s right to appeal *in forma pauperis* is governed by 28 U.S.C. § 1915 which provides that, “[a]n appeal may not be taken in forma pauperis if the trial court certifies in writing that it is not taken in good faith.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3). “Because the good faith standard is an objective one, an appeal is deemed not taken in good faith if the issues presented are frivolous. An appeal is considered frivolous when it is based on an ‘indisputably meritless legal theory or factual allegations that are clearly baseless.’” Lyons v. Wall, No. 04-380, 2007 WL 2067661 at *1 (D.R.I. July 13, 2007) (internal citations omitted).

In the present case, Price’s Motion for Certificate of Appealability was denied by Chief District Judge Smith because Price “failed to make a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” (Document No. 31 in 04-38S; Document No. 20 in 12-24S). Thus, despite the

fact that Price qualifies for pauper status based solely on his financial status, he has failed to make such a showing of a denial of a Constitutional right. Because the Court has determined that Petitioner is not entitled to appeal at all, he is not entitled to appeal IFP, and I recommend his Motion be DENIED. (Document No. 36 in 04-38S; Document No. 25 in 12-24S).

Any objection to this Report and Recommendation must be specific and must be filed with the Clerk of the Court within fourteen (14) days of its receipt. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); LR Cv 72. Failure to file specific objections in a timely manner constitutes waiver of the right to review by the District Court and the right to appeal the District Court's decision. See United States v. Valencia-Copete, 792 F.2d 4, 6 (1st Cir. 1986); Park Motor Mart, Inc. v. Ford Motor Co., 616 F.2d 603, 605 (1st Cir. 1980).

/s/ Lincoln D. Almond
LINCOLN D. ALMOND
United States Magistrate Judge
January 8, 2014